



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/602,059	06/23/2000	Charles M. McKenna	V0077/7117 WRM	9493
75	590 03/25/2004		EXAM	INER
Gary L Loser			EL SHAMMAA, MARY A	
Varian Semicor	nductor Equipment Assoc	iates Inc		
35 Dory Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Gloucester, MA	IA 01930 2881			
			DATE MAIL ED. 02/25/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)		
	09/602,059		
Advisory Action	Examiner	<u> </u>	
	Mary A. El-Shammaa	2881	Au
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			dress
THE REPLY FILED 05 February 2004 FAILS TO PLATHEREFORM Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	ACE THIS APPLICATION IN Concept and abandonment of this and a timely filed amendment peal (with appeal fee); or (3) and appeal fee);	CONDITION FOR ALLO Ipplication. A proper re t which places the appl	OWANCE. eply to a ication in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W. 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set fortion than SIX MONTHS from the mailing of AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS On the on which the petition under 37 Cl	date of the final rejection. F THE FINAL REJECTION. FR 1.136(a) and the appropria	See MPEP
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ned statutory period for reply originally	set in the final Office action; o	r (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 0)			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require ful	rther consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below)	,
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Not	te below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can NOTE:	celing a corresponding number	er of finally rejected cla	ims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	jection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted i	n a separate, timely file	ed amendment
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request application in condition for allowance because:		considered but does N	IOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which w	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims			d and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	approved or b)⊡ disapprove	d by the Examiner.	

10. Other: ____

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Response has been considered, but the arguments do not overcome the rejection of the claims. In response to the Applicant's arguments, Takahashi et al. discloses, as claimed in the independent claims, a deceleration stage positioned downstream of an analyzer for decelerating the ion beam, from a first transport energy to a final energy lower than the first transport energy. (See Takahashi et al. col. 3, lines 4-20 and 49-54.) Particularly, Takahashi et al. overcomes the Applicant's arguments of transporting an ion beam at a first transport energy through the initial portion of the implanter and the energy of the ion beam is decelerated before being implanted into the target with a final energy lower than the first transport energy. In col. 3, lines 4-20, Takahashi et al. discloses decelerating the beam from a high energy (first transport energy) to a low energy (final transport energy lower than the first transport energy) before being implanted. This overcomes the arguments of the invention, as claimed.

SUPERVISORY PROFESS OF A STANDARD STAND